

Appl. No. : 10/066,286
Filed : February 1, 2002

REMARKS

Claims 2, 3, 5, 8, 12-14, 21-24 and 26-31 have been amended by this paper, and Claims 1, 20 and 25 have been cancelled. Claims 4, 6, 7, 9-11 and 15-19 remain unchanged by this Amendment. Hence, by this paper, Claims 2-19, 21-24 and 26-31 are presented for further examination.

A. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) and 103 (a)

In the Office Action mailed June 17, 2003, Claims 1, 2, 4, 14, 20, 25 28, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Yoshizawa* (Japanese Patent No. 411102246A, hereafter "*Yoshizawa*"). In addition, Claims 3, 10-13, 15-19, 22, 24, 27 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) were rejected as being unpatentable over *Yoshizawa*.

In view of the amendments presented herein, Applicant believes that the above-identified claims now define subject matter which is patentable over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the above-identified rejections be withdrawn.

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 5-9, 21-23, 26 and 30 were objected to as being dependent from a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response thereto, Applicant has amended Claims 5, 8, 21, 23, 26, and 30 to incorporate into these claims the subject matter of the claims from which they depend. Accordingly, these claims now comprise independent claims, which include limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim, to the extent necessary to define subject matter corresponding to that which the Examiner identified as the basis for his statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter. These claims have also been modified to remove any inconsistencies occurring as a result of the inclusion of the limitations of the base claim and the intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicant submits that independent Claims 5, 8, 21, 23, 26 and 30 now define subject matter which is patentable over the art of record.

Further to the above, Applicant has amended Claim 14 to more fully define the latch member which was originally in that claim, and in particular, to indicate that the keyboard section which is housed in a nested fashion within the at least one keyboard member "is secured within the at least one keyboard member by a latch member." Applicant respectfully submits

Appl. No. : 10/066,286
Filed : February 1, 2002

that there is neither any teaching nor suggestion in the *Yoshizawa* reference, nor in any of the other art of record, of a computer keyboard assembly as defined in Claim 14, including the claimed latch member. Thus, Applicant submits that independent Claim 14, as amended, also defines subject matter which is patentable over the art of record.

In view of the amendments presented herein, as described above, Applicant respectfully submits that Independent Claims 5, 8, 14, 21, 23, 26, and 30 are patentable for the reasons set forth above. In addition, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 4, dependent claims 2-4, 6, 7, 9-13, 14, dependent claims 2-4, 6, 7, 9-13, 15-19, 22, 24, 27-29 and 31 also define patentable subject matter since each incorporates, directly or indirectly, the limitations of one of Claims 5, 8, 14, 21, 23, 26 or 30 from which they respectively depend.

CONCLUSION

The Applicant has endeavored to address all of the concerns of the Examiner in view of the recent Office Action directed to the above-identified application. Accordingly, amendments to the claims for patentability purposes, the reasons therefor and arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claims are presented above. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-19, 21-24, and 26-31 are now in condition for immediate allowance and such prompt allowance of the same is respectfully requested.

Any claim amendments which are not specifically discussed in the above remarks are not made for patentability purposes, and it is believed that the claims would satisfy the statutory requirements for patentability without the entry of such amendments. Rather, these amendments have only been made to increase claim readability, to improve grammar, and to reduce the time and effort required of those in the art to clearly understand the scope of the claim language.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is specifically requested. If the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to initiate the same with the undersigned.

Appl. No. : 10/066,286
Filed : February 1, 2002

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: Aug. 26, 2003

By: Drew S. Hamilton

Drew S. Hamilton

Registration No. Drew S. Hamilton

Attorney of Record

Customer No. 20,995

(619) 235-8550

S:\DOCS\DSH\DSH-4418.DOC
071503